DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 971 EA 011 998

AUTHOR Camp, William G.; Bourn, Lawton P., Jr.
TITLE Student Discipline: An Analysis of Teacher and Administrator Perceptions.
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the International Congress on Education (2nd, Vancouver, British Columbia, June 17-20, 1979); Table may be marginally legible due to small print

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Discipline; *Literature Reviews; Secondary Education; *Student Behavior; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Indiana

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses research findings concerning student discipline problems in Indiana secondary schools. Issues explored attempted to determine (1) what specific student behaviors are perceived by teachers and administrators to be discipline problems, (2) how frequently these problems occur, (3) how serious teachers and administrators perceive the problems to be, and (4) how much the identified discipline problems interfere with the learning environment. Questionnaires were mailed to a sample of secondary school teachers and administrators in Indiana. Of the 101 student misbehaviors listed, only 47 were perceived to be discipline problems by a majority of the teachers responding. The paper concludes that teachers who deal with the individual classroom work of the student hold different perceptions of student discipline than administrators who must be concerned with the problems of the school at large. Related literature on the subject of student discipline is reviewed in detail in this document. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED173971

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Student Discipline: An Analysis of Teacher and Administrator Perceptions

by

William G. Camp, Ph.D.

and

Lawton P. Bourn, Jr. M.S.

Purdue University

for

The Second International Congress
On Education

Vancouver, British Columbia
June 1979

EA 011 998

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE T
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
W. Camp
L. Bourn
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOUR
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The last ten annual Gallup Polls on education have concluded that student discipline is the concern held most frequently about U.S. education. Over the past fifteen years, in excess of two hundred books, articles, and papers have been published in the United States alone dealing with various aspects of student discipline. At the same time, however, there appears to be very little research-based objective information available to indicate what student discipline problems are actually being faced by educators in the field.

The purpose of this paper is to present the findings of a study conducted by the authors to determine the following:

1. What specific student behaviors are perceived by teachers and administrators to be problems in student discipline as opposed to other kinds of problems?
2. How frequently do these identified discipline problems occur in Indiana schools?
3. How serious do teachers and administrators perceive the identified student discipline problems to be?
4. How much do the identified discipline problems interfere with the learning environment as perceived by teachers and administrators.

The findings of the study are limited to Indiana public secondary schools and should not be generalized to wider populations on the basis of this survey alone.

Related Literature

Probably the most authoritative study on student discipline in the United States during this century is the work by Wickman (1929) done in the Minneapolis and Cleveland school systems. He compiled a list of fifty specific observed

undesirable student behaviors, collecting data on frequency of occurrence and on level of perceived seriousness from teachers in those school systems. Wickman's work remains to this day one of very few empirical studies dealing with student discipline.

An extensive library and computer search of more current educational literature resulted in a great many items dealing in one way or another with the broad construct of student discipline. Unfortunately, almost all of the publications merely reflected the tenets of psychological or learning theories or the personal experiences of the writers. Many of the works cited only a few specific student misbehaviors or categories of misbehaviors, suggesting possible strategies for coping with such problems. Other publications offered general strategies for teachers to use in dealing with or avoiding unspecified student discipline problems. The citations which follow were selected to present a representative picture of the types of works that have been published in recent years on this subject.

In a series of articles on discipline, the National Education Association (1969) presents a number of hypothetical classroom incidents or discipline problems. A "typical incident" is given, followed by an analysis and proposed solution offered by an authoratative individual. There is no effort to ascertain what behaviors actually exist or how they are perceived by teachers but rather the assumption is made that the behaviors treated are representative of problems in the field.

Still another treatment of discipline behaviors is a Self-Directive Day as described by Colver and Richter (1971). During Self-Directive Day, a student signs a "contract" in which he agrees to attend all scheduled classes and homeroom, obey all laws, refrain from vandalism, smoking, the misuse of drugs, and other activities which might be disruptive to the education process.

Stiavelli and Sykes (1972) describe a guidance clinic program based on behavior modification theory and positive reinforcement established to provide an alternative to the routine procedure for dealing with disruptive students, primarily impulsive anger. This is the only discipline behavior discussed since the thrust of their article deals with the treatment rather than the problem.

Mikulsky (1976) presents a very detailed, annotated bibliography on discipline in the schools. However, the five topic areas he covers: (1) the relationship between discipline and learning; (2) attitudes toward behavior problems and discipline; (3) corporal punishment; (4) the role of the disciplinarian; and (5) solutions to discipline problems (including behavior modifications, the role of the teacher and programs and systems for improving discipline), do not include works identifying the specific discipline behaviors of which the five areas are concerned. In addition, in the entire work there are only two references which deal with the identification and ranking of a quantity of behaviors in terms of their seriousness and importance

Hollomon (1976) asked teachers to list and describe in descending order no more than three behaviors they perceived to be most unacceptable in the classroom. Those behaviors requested were to be only those which interferred with the teacher. The teachers were also asked to describe, in descending order, no more than three techniques they judged to be most effective in dealing with the three behaviors.

The National Education Association (1976) conducted a nationwide survey of public school teachers to determine what teachers feel about discipline and violence in the schools. The survey showed that student violence and physical attacks on teachers were two of the more important problems. Other behaviors concerning teachers were impertinence and discourtesy, theft

(small), destruction of school property, theft (large), carrying dangerous weapons, and rape. The report gave the results of the frequency of occurrence for these behaviors but did not list what other behaviors were identified.

Lambert (1976) discusses behavior clinics used in an urban-rural area of five secondary schools as substitutes for suspension. Some misbehaviors which can lead to placement in the behavior clinic are: truancy, fighting, use of obscene language, smoking, and disrespectfulness. By means of two rating scales, one for teachers and one for students, she determined that both students and teachers felt that the behavior clinics were generally worthwhile and beneficial.

Griggs (1977) concludes an article on classroom management with nine principles she advocates as being essential to helping students become disciplined. Without serious question the principles are important, well-founded on psychological principles, and reflect a teacher's desire to identify means of successfully coping with discipline problems in the classroom. However, the article proposes a treatment for general discipline problems not identified by the author.

Sanders (1977) offers another work advocating the importance of classroom discipline and offers suggestions that may be helpful to teachers facing discipline problems in general. Proceeding on the assumption that pupils must be taught discipline, the author discusses ways of modifying the classroom environment and suggests ways to direct and encourage pupils to acceptable behavior.

Gorton (1977) offers some means of handling discipline problems with nonpunitive measures such as: involving all available pupil-services personnel, behavior modification, and alternative education programs such as work-study programs or special classes. Gorton describes other approaches

such as a student ombudsman, grievance committee to hear and take action on students' concerns about their school, "crisis rooms" to help students calm down prior to returning to the classroom. Gorton doesn't say that these types of measures will eliminate discipline problems, but he does feel that, properly implemented, they could eventually reduce the misbehavior.

Eckbreth (1978) cites problems she feels are most common in the secondary schools, among them are: excessive talking in class, attention-getting actions, students fighting or threatening to punch other students, students insulting or being rude to others, and habitual tardiness.

Nickerson (1978) deals with the student as an individual and discusses the role of the schools, making the assumption that if schools become more personal places the anarchy found in those schools will disappear. In his opinion, the problem can be righted if the emphasis is changed to the needs of the individual student from what is being taught, the mechanics of operation, the building itself, or other objectives.

A Behavioral Attitude Change (BAC) program is discussed by Fuchs, Feen, and Reid (1978). Dealing with disruptive classroom behavior, lack of motivation, chronic truancy from school or class, lack of self-control, and other similar problems, the article describes the intracies of the BAC program as it attempts to deal with student behavior modification.

Glasser (1978) offers 10 steps to good discipline in the schools, stressing that his steps will only work in a school where "people would normally choose to be - in the school which is continually striving to be a good place". He explains that a good place is one where administrators support and participate in an approach to discipline that teaches self-responsibility.

One of the most exhausing and informative citations reviewed was a report by Feldhusen (1978) which deals with behavior problems in the secondary schools.

The work was an effort to review and clarify the problems, identify causes, and examine programs and procedures for remediating or preventing such behavior. However, throughout the entire work, there are only slight references to the types and extent of behaviors to be found in the schools. The central theme in most of the collected cases reviewed is that of student violence, either toward people or property. There are references to other behaviors as part of the overall problem, but the particular issue most often cited as the serious one is that of violence.

One of the few works which does deal with a rather extensive listing of behavioral problems as well as treatments is Dobson, Dobson, and Kinkaid (1971). Their study hypothesized that junior high school students and teachers differed in their perceptions of disciplinary problems and in the prescriptions of treatment for students who exhibit such behavioral problems. By means of a list of 32 behaviors based primarily on Wickman (1929), their findings indicated that teachers viewed defacing school property, petty thievery, physical attack on teachers, truancy, general rudeness, and cheating on assignments and/or tests as the most serious of the items listed. Junior high boys viewed smoking, cruelty or bullying, defacing school property, cheating on class assignments and/or tests, and committing petty thievery as the most serious. Junior high girls viewed defacing school property, cheating on class assignments, smoking, truancy, and committing petty thievery as the most serious. The differences between students and teachers regarding treatments for behaviors was obvious with teachers prescribing more desirable treatments for discipline problems. In terms of the current study, this citation was one of the most valuable since it was one of the few which even approach an empirical effort to determine perceptions and identification of specific student discipline problems.

Thompson (1976) argues that a very serious difference exists between those behaviors which are legitimate discipline problems (i.e. <u>real</u>) and those

behaviors which are merely perceived by the teacher to be discipline problems. He contends that not only are many physiological and psychological problems of students incorrectly being dealt with as discipline problems, he even argues that too much discipline in the classroom is counterproductive. Thompson's thesis is that teachers should learn to differentiate between real and perceived discipline problems.

Rationale

Of all the works reviewed, only Wickman (1929) and Dobson (1971) presented detailed lists of empirically based specific student misbehaviors actually occuring in the schools. Of those two studies, the more authoritative was Wickman's which is now approximately fifty years old. Dobson's work, albeit well done, could not be generalized beyond his specific study group in a junior high school in Florida and, further, simply selected thirty-two of Wickman's original list of undesirable behaviors. Clearly, a more current list of student misbehaviors is lacking in the literature. The first objective of this study, therefore, was to generate a new list of student misbehaviors based on current educational literature and validated by educational theoreticians and practitioners in the field.

Thompson (1976) very convincingly argues that not all undesirable student behaviors can be justifiably regarded as discipline problems. He contends that there are two types of discipline problems: real and perceived, presumably real being a subset of perceived. Realizing that philosophically and psychologically this is a very strong argument, one must still accept the fact that it is the practitioner on the line and not the theoretician who must deal with student behavior on a day-to-day basis. This obvious paradox gave rise to the second objective of the study which was to determine which

of those undesirable student behaviors are perceived by teachers and administrators to be discipline problems.

Once having identified a student misbehavior as a discipline problem whether real or merely perceived, then the obvious questions arise: How often does it occur? If, or when, it does occur, how serious is the problem perceived to be? If, or when, it does occur, how much does the behavior interfere with the learning environment?

Methodology

The list of student misbehaviors which formed the basis for the instrument was collected during the literature search. The initial list was a compilation of all those statements by the reviewed authors which delineated student behaviors, mannerisms, or characteristics viewed as causing concern or expressly cited as disciplinary in nature. This initial list was quite extensive and contained a large number of obvious duplications as well as items which could hardly be interpreted as discipline problems. The list was edited to remove those duplicated items as well as to improve the clarity of the retained items.

The revised list was submitted to a panel of experts consisting of eight scholars and administrators from both the university and secondary school levels. The panel members were specifically instructed not to determine which items were in fact discipline problems, but rather were to judge whether the items were undesirable student behaviors which were of concern to educators. Additionally, they were asked to review the list for duplications and ambiguities and to determine whether any further items were needed. The result of the foregoing process was a validated list of 101 student misbehaviors which are of general concern to educators. It does not represent solely a list of

student discipline problems, but rather includes discipline problems among other types of misbehaviors.

The list of student misbehaviors was then incorporated into an instrument in two sections. Section one consists of a letter to the respondent explaining the purpose of the study and a biographical data section which includes: sex of respondent, type of school, size of school, highest degree held, grades taught, major subject area, type of position held, and years of experience. Section two includes a set of instructions followed by the validated list of student misbehaviors with spaces provided for the required responses.

The instructions indicate that the respondent is to go through the list of student behaviors and check those items he perceives to be discipline problems (Part A). He is then asked to go through the list a second time and rate each previously checked item in three areas: frequency of occurrence (Part B1), level of seriousness (Part B2), and degree of interference (Part B3). The rating scales are as follows:

Frequency of Occurence - Part B 1:

0 Never observed
1 Once or more in semester
2 Once or more monthly
3 Once or more weekly
4 Once or more daily

Level of Seriousness - Part B 2:

0 Not concerned
1 Slightly concerned
2 Moderately concerned
3 Very concerned
4 Extremely concerned

Degree of Interference - Part B 3:

0 Doesn't interfere
1 Disturbs only one or two students
2 Disturbs surrounding students
3 Temporarily distracts entire class
4 Class must be stopped until situation is corrected

The completed instrument is entitled "Survey of Discipline Problem Behaviors in Indiana Secondary Schools," copyright 1979, by Purdue Research Foundation.

A stratified random sample of all secondary level teachers and administrators in Indiana was selected to receive the survey instrument. During the first week of February a total of 1086 copies of the anonymous-but-coded instrument along with stamped, self-addressed envelopes were mailed. Three weeks later a follow-up letter was mailed to all those persons who had not returned the completed instrument. After a total of five weeks, 310 usable surveys had been returned.

The instruments were then coded and transferred to data cards. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized to analyze the data. For the purpose of this specific paper, only the frequencies program was utilized. Because of the exploratory nature of this preliminary study, no specific hypothesis testing was done and simple descriptive data are presented in this paper.

Findings

Of the 101 student misbehaviors, only 47 were perceived to be discipline problems by a majority of the teachers responding to the survey (N=248, see Table 9). The percentage of teachers perceiving various behaviors to be discipline problems ranged from 12.1 percent for student activism (underground newspapers, agitation, etc.) to 79.4 percent for ambivalence, (Table 1).

For the administrators responding (N=25) the percentages ranged from 16.0 percent for such behaviors as sulking and tattling to 92.0 percent for absenteeism (truancy),(Table 2). Even though both the lowest and highest percentages were given by administrators, only 46 behaviors were perceived by over 50 percent of the administrators responding to be problems in discipline, (Table 9).

Table 1

Behaviors Perceived to be Discipline Problems by Highest Percentage of Teachers
N=248

Rank	Behavior	% Perceiving to be Discipline
1	Ambivalence (doesn't care attitude)	79.4
2	Vandalism to school property (cutting, breaking, marring marking)	76.6
3	Clowning/follish behavior	73.0
4	Disrespectful toward school personnel (insults, rudeness, etc.)	72.2
5	Tardiness to class	70.6
6	Abusing privileges (hall, bathroom, office, etc.)	70.2
7-8	Cheating in class (on tests, projects, classwork, etc.)	69.4
	Not paying attention in class or trying not to learn	69.4
9	Infraction of school rules/policies	67.7
10	Failing to bring books, paper, etc.	67.3
⋮		
101	Student activism (underground newspapers, agitation, etc.)	12.1

Table 2

Behaviors Perceived to be Discipline Problems by Highest Percentage of Administrators
N=25

Rank	Behavior	% Perceiving to be Discipline
1	Absenteeism (truancy)	92.0
2	Tardiness to class	88.0
3-6	Skipping class	84.0
	Tardiness to school	84.0
	Infraction of school rules/policies	84.0
	Vandalism to school property (cutting, breaking, marring, marking, etc.)	84.0
7-8	Destroying own or other's property	80.0
	Smoking, chewing tobacco in any form	80.0
9-10	Abusing privileges (hall, bathroom, office, etc.)	76.0
	Smoking marijuana (before school)	76.0
⋮		
98-101	Rejection of normal means, not ends	16.0
	Rejection of values by demeanor	16.0
	Suspicious of teacher/others	16.0
	Tattling	16.0

An examination of Tables 1 and 2 reveals an interesting, if not surprising, difference in those items perceived to be discipline problems by the largest percentages of teachers and administrators. As one might expect, the teachers' top ten included primarily behaviors which could be characterized as fairly passive displays of negative attitudes: ambivalence, clowning/foolish behavior, disrespectfulness, tardiness to class, cheating, not paying attention or trying not to learn, failing to bring books and paper (Table 1). The top ten list for the administrators centered around more active types of behaviors: absenteeism (truancy), skipping class, vandalism to school property, destroying own or other's property, smoking, smoking marijuana before school (Table 2). Both lists included tardiness to class, abusing privileges, and vandalism to school property.

Table 3 lists the ten most frequently observed student behavior problems as rated by teachers. Again, ambivalence heads the list for teachers, with tardiness to class and not paying attention in class or trying not to learn appearing as repeat items from Table 1. Table 4 gives the equivalent results for administrators. Heading the frequency list for administrators was the rather general misbehavior of infraction of school rules/policies followed by tardiness to school and abusing privileges (hall, bathroom, office, etc.) The apparent implication of these two lists is that both teachers and administrators perceive the most frequently occuring student misbehaviors to be those dealing in general with passive rather than active offences and imply lack of motivation on the parts of the offending students rather than destructiveness or aggressiveness.

Table 3

Behaviors Rated Highest by Teachers on Frequency of Observation

Rank	Behavior	Mean Rating
1	Ambivalence (doesn't care attitude)	3.50
2	Not paying attention in class or trying not to learn	3.45
3	Not following instructions	3.44
4	Failing to bring books, paper, etc.	3.41
5-6	Idleness	3.40
5-6	Running in the halls	3.40
7	Inattentiveness (daydreaming, etc.)	3.37
8	Failing to do homework	3.33
9-10	Squirming, fidgeting	3.30
9-10	Tardiness to class	3.30

Table 4

Behaviors Rated Highest by Administrators on Frequency of Observation

Rank	Behavior	Mean Rating
1	Infraction of school rules/policies	3.75
2	Tardiness to school	3.67
3	Abusing privileges (hall, bathroom, office, etc.)	3.63
4	Squirming, fidgeting	3.62
5	Not following instructions	3.60
6	Tardiness to class	3.59
7-9	Failing to do in-class assignments	3.54
7-9	Failing to do homework	3.54
7-9	Failing to turn in homework when due	3.54
10	Talking without permission	3.40

Tables 5 and 6 present those student misbehaviors perceived by teachers and administrators, respectively, as being of the most serious nature if, or when, they should occur. Teachers considered homicides (actual or attempted) at the top of the list, followed by use of drugs other than marijuana (while at school) bringing weapons to school or school functions, rape or attempted rape, then smoking marijuana (while at school). Administrators perceived the most serious student misbehaviors to be use of drugs other than marijuana (while at school) followed in order by use of drugs other than marijuana (before school), providing illegal substances (selling, giving away, trading etc.), use of alcohol (while at school), smoking marijuana (before school), and use of marijuana (while at school). This provides an interesting contrast in that teachers tended to perceive violence as being the most serious type of student misbehavior while administrators perceived drug and drug related activities to be most serious.

Tables 7 and 8 list those student misbehaviors perceived by teachers and administrators as causing the greatest degree of interference with an orderly teaching/learning process if, or when, they should occur. Teachers placed striking teacher at the top of the list, followed by homicides (actual or attempted), defiance (openly and boldly resisting), and injuring others (intentional). Administrators rated threatening teacher highest in degree of interference, followed by angry outbursts, responding disrespectfully to teacher, and threat of physical violence.

Complete data for all 101 items on all four ratings by teachers and administrators, from which Tables 1 through 8 were extracted, are presented in Table 9.

Table 5

Behaviors Rated Highest by Teachers on Level of Seriousness

Rank	Behaviors	Mean Rating
1	Homicides (actual or attempted)	3.69
2	Use of drugs other than marijuana (while at school)	3.56
3	Bringing weapons to school or school functions	3.55
4-5	Rape or attempted rape	3.51
	Smoking marijuana (while at school)	3.51
6	Striking teacher	3.50
7-8	Threatening teacher	3.47
	Use of drugs other than marijuana (before school)	3.47
9	Use of alcohol (while at school)	3.41
10	Theft	3.38

Table 6

Behaviors Rated Highest by Administrators on Level of Seriousness

Rank	Behaviors	Mean Rating
1	Use of drugs other than marijuana (while at school)	3.92
2-3	Use of drugs other than marijuana (before school)	3.86
	Providing illegal substances (selling, giving away, trading, etc.)	3.86
4	Use of alcohol (while at school)	3.82
5	Smoking marijuana (before school)	3.79
6	Smoking marijuana (while at school)	3.77
7-8	Threatening teacher	3.67
	Use of alcohol (before school)	3.67
9-10	Threatening other students	3.57
	Vandalism to school property (cutting, breaking, marking, marring, etc.)	3.57

Table 7

Behaviors Rated Highest by Teachers on Degree of Interference

Rank	Behavior	Mean Rating
1	Striking teacher	3.53
2	Homicides (actual or attempted)	3.37
3	Injuring others (intentional)	3.23
4	Defiance (openly and boldly resisting)	3.21
5-7	Rape or attempted rape	3.13
	Threatening teacher	3.13
	Threat of physical violence	3.13
8	Hitting, fighting with other students	3.10
9-10	Angry outbursts	3.07
	Responding disrespectfully to teacher	3.07

Table 8

Behaviors Rated Highest by Administrators on Degree of Interference

Rank	Behavior	Mean Rating
1	Threatening teacher	3.42
2	Angry outbursts	3.17
3-4	Responding disrespectfully to teacher	3.07
	Threat of physical violence	3.07
5	Confrontations with authority figures (arguments, bold and open defiance)	3.00
6	Disruption of class/school routine	2.93
7	Disorderly, rebellious (alienation from authority)	2.92
8	Using foul, obscene, abusing language	2.82
9	Throwing objects (spitballs, paperwads, rocks, rubber bands, etc.)	2.80
10	Defiance (openly and boldly resisting)	2.79

Table 9

Summary of Ratings of 101 Student Misbehaviors by Teachers and Administrators

	Behavior	% Perceiving As Discipline		Mean Frequency of Observation		Mean Level of Seriousness		Mean Degree of Interference	
		Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators
1.	Absenteeism (excused but excessive)	62.1	72.0	2.99	3.28	2.75	3.06	1.20	1.27
2.	Absenteeism (truancy)	55.6	92.0	2.82	3.22	2.78	3.26	1.10	1.20
3.	Abusing privileges (hall, bathroom, office, etc.)	70.2	76.0	2.96	3.63	2.49	2.74	1.41	1.71
4.	Aggressive behavior (bullying, attempts to dominate)	57.7	56.0	2.38	2.57	2.57	2.93	2.36	2.23
5.	Ambivalence (doesn't care attitude)	79.4	60.0	3.50	3.20	3.17	2.73	1.54	1.86
6.	Angry outbursts	54.8	48.0	2.07	2.75	2.58	2.83	3.07	3.17
7.	Aggogance/antagonism	53.2	56.0	2.46	2.71	2.47	2.79	2.50	2.43
8.	Blaming others (not assuming responsibility)	58.1	44.0	2.71	2.73	2.48	2.27	1.57	1.70
9.	Bringing pornographic materials to school/class.	26.2	32.0	0.65	1.12	2.07	2.12	1.75	1.00
10.	Bringing weapons to school or school functions	29.0	40.0	0.41	1.00	3.55	3.30	2.74	2.00
11.	Cheating in class (on tests, projects, classwork, etc.)	69.4	64.0	2.20	2.50	2.97	2.88	1.48	1.47
12.	Cheating outside class (plagarizing, copying homework, etc.)	46.8	44.0	2.35	2.27	2.78	2.46	0.98	1.10
13.	Clowning/foolish behavior	73.0	52.0	3.19	3.00	2.19	1.54	2.78	2.25
14.	Conflicts between ethnic/racial groups	28.2	28.0	0.99	0.71	2.59	2.14	2.58	3.29
15.	Confrontations with authority figures (arguments, bold and open defiance)	62.9	64.0	2.09	2.50	3.10	3.25	3.01	3.00
16.	Defiance (openly and boldly resisting)	62.5	60.0	1.88	2.00	3.15	3.13	3.21	2.79
17.	Destroying own or other's property	66.9	80.0	2.14	2.25	3.20	3.10	1.94	1.72
18.	Dirty hands and face, body odor (personal hygiene)	32.7	28.0	2.47	2.29	2.49	2.14	1.58	1.57
19.	Disorderly, rebellious (alienation from authority)	56.5	48.0	2.20	2.38	3.12	2.92	2.90	2.92
20.	Disrespectful toward school personal (insults, rudeness, etc.)	72.2	72.0	2.42	2.44	3.17	3.22	2.45	2.59
21.	Disrespectful toward other students	64.5	56.0	3.00	2.93	3.06	2.79	2.37	1.83
22.	Disruption of class/school routines	61.7	60.0	2.57	3.13	2.88	2.73	3.07	2.93
23.	Eating/drinking in class (candy, food, gum, etc.)	53.6	44.0	2.87	3.36	1.90	1.64	1.73	1.64
24.	Failing to bring books, paper, etc.	67.3	60.0	3.41	3.33	2.80	2.40	1.76	1.64

Behavior	% Perceiving As Discipline		Mean Frequency of Observation		Mean Level of Seriousness		Mean Degree of Interference	
	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators
25. Failing to do in-class assignments	59.3	44.0	3.11	3.54	2.92	2.45	1.46	1.91
26. Failing to do homework	60.9	44.0	3.33	3.54	3.00	2.64	1.23	1.73
27. Failing to turn in homework when due	53.6	44.0	3.28	3.54	2.89	2.73	1.17	1.82
28. Gambling (cards, penny-tossing, etc.)	30.2	36.0	1.38	1.11	2.25	2.44	2.07	1.89
29. Getting out of seat without permission/moving about	43.1	36.0	2.84	2.78	2.10	2.00	2.34	2.11
30. Disrupting group activities	39.5	32.0	2.09	1.62	2.60	2.50	2.90	2.38
31. Hitting, fighting with other students	52.8	64.0	1.87	2.50	2.95	3.25	3.10	2.73
32. Hollering, yelling	52.4	44.0	2.74	3.18	2.52	1.91	2.94	2.36
33. Homicides (attempted or actual)	22.6	28.0	0.14	0.14	3.69	3.00	3.37	2.50
34. Hyperactivity (abnormally active)	40.3	32.0	2.71	2.38	2.38	2.00	2.29	2.00
35. Idleness	49.2	24.0	3.40	2.67	2.70	2.33	1.15	1.33
36. Injuring others (intentional)	33.5	44.0	1.12	1.64	3.38	3.09	3.23	2.18
37. Injuring self (intentional)	20.6	28.0	0.62	0.43	3.37	3.00	3.02	2.00
38. Ignoring teacher	57.3	56.0	2.92	2.93	2.95	2.93	2.22	2.14
39. Inattentiveness (daydreaming, etc.)	64.9	56.0	3.37	3.21	2.65	2.50	1.21	1.38
40. Infraction of school rules/policies	67.7	84.0	3.23	3.75	2.99	3.19	2.11	2.00
41. Interfering with work of others	53.6	48.0	3.08	2.75	3.07	2.42	2.34	1.92
42. Lying (to teacher, others)	58.5	56.0	2.45	2.71	3.03	2.79	1.45	1.29
43. Making loud noises/laughing at inappropriate times	57.3	44.0	2.86	3.00	2.55	2.27	2.96	2.64
44. Making obscene gestures	39.9	48.0	1.74	2.00	2.54	2.67	2.24	2.25
45. Name calling	50.0	56.0	2.81	3.00	2.59	2.29	2.32	2.00
46. Negative attitudes toward authorities	63.3	64.0	3.03	3.12	3.08	3.19	1.86	2.13
47. Negative attitude toward school	66.9	64.0	3.21	3.38	2.99	3.12	1.63	1.88
48. Noise (pencil or foot tapping, etc.)	48.0	32.0	3.15	2.88	2.09	2.12	2.32	2.12
49. Not following instructions	61.3	44.0	3.44	3.64	2.94	2.82	1.83	2.33
50. Not paying attention in class or trying not to learn	69.4	56.0	3.45	3.21	3.08	2.93	1.50	2.15
51. Note passing	44.8	20.0	2.66	2.60	1.71	1.60	1.59	1.60
52. Obscene notes/writings/graffiti	37.9	52.0	1.85	2.15	2.41	2.46	1.62	1.77
53. Passive evasion (hiding, delaying, stalling or errands, etc.)	44.8	40.0	2.43	2.40	2.29	2.20	1.22	1.20
54. Students picketing or student strikes	16.5	24.0	0.33	0.33	2.10	2.17	2.33	2.60
55. Profanity	66.5	60.0	3.16	2.80	2.82	3.00	2.32	1.93
56. Providing illegal substances (selling, giving away, trading, etc.)	42.3	56.0	1.40	1.93	3.33	3.86	2.10	2.21
57. Protests, political	12.9	24.0	0.24	0.17	2.02	2.00	2.05	2.00
58. Protests, racial	14.9	24.0	0.27	0.17	2.55	2.33	2.54	2.50
59. Racial or ethnic oriented disturbances between individuals	22.6	24.0	0.64	0.33	2.67	2.50	2.71	2.50

	Behavior	% Perceiving As Discipline		Mean Frequency of Observation		Mean Level of Seriousness		Mean Degree of Interference	
		Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators
60.	Rape or attempted rape	21.0	24.0	0.12	0.0	3.51	3.33	3.13	2.67
61.	Reading non-school related materials in class	35.1	28.0	2.33	2.29	1.75	2.29	1.07	1.29
62.	Rejection of normal means, not ends	18.1	16.0	2.45	2.00	2.46	1.75	1.73	1.75
63.	Rejection of values by demeanor	26.6	16.0	2.53	2.25	2.72	2.00	2.02	1.75
64.	Responding disrespectfully to teacher	55.2	60.0	2.49	2.73	3.12	3.33	3.07	3.07
65.	Ritualism (clubs, gangs, cliques, etc)	19.0	28.0	1.72	0.57	1.96	2.14	1.57	1.57
66.	Running in the halls	57.3	56.0	3.40	3.08	2.15	2.00	1.30	1.58
67.	Shyness, timidity, withdrawing from social interaction	31.5	32.0	2.88	2.62	2.54	2.12	0.87	0.50
68.	Skipping class	58.5	84.0	2.62	3.05	2.71	3.33	0.69	0.95
69.	Sleeping in class	45.2	36.0	2.36	2.33	2.28	2.22	1.14	1.44
70.	Slovenly manner/appearance	27.4	36.0	3.10	3.00	2.55	2.89	1.27	1.44
71.	Smoking/chewing tobacco in any form	48.4	80.0	2.53	2.80	2.67	2.85	1.72	1.37
72.	Smoking marijuana (before school)	49.2	76.0	1.77	1.94	3.35	3.79	1.83	1.29
73.	Smoking marijuana (while at school)	49.6	52.0	1.52	1.54	3.51	3.77	2.05	1.08
74.	Socially delinquent behavior (indecent exposure, etc.)	27.0	28.0	0.49	0.67	3.10	2.71	2.86	2.00
75.	Squirming, fidgeting	29.0	32.0	3.30	3.62	2.13	2.00	1.74	1.86
76.	Stealing exams or tests	26.2	40.0	0.46	0.90	3.10	2.89	1.59	2.11
77.	Stimulating collective behavior (crowds, gangs, mobs, etc.)	27.4	36.0	1.07	1.11	2.76	2.44	2.59	2.44
78.	Striking teacher	27.0	24.0	0.27	0.33	3.50	2.50	3.53	2.67
79.	Student activism (underground newspapers, agitation, etc.)	12.1	28.0	0.33	0.43	2.05	1.86	1.26	1.33
80.	Sulking	32.7	20.0	2.64	2.80	2.11	1.60	1.33	0.60
81.	Suspicious of teacher/others	23.8	16.0	2.18	2.50	2.34	2.50	1.13	1.25
82.	Talking without permission	66.5	60.0	3.62	3.40	2.36	2.27	2.65	2.07
83.	Tardiness to class	70.6	88.0	3.30	3.59	2.64	3.13	2.24	2.14
84.	Tardiness to school	53.2	84.0	3.29	3.67	2.58	3.09	1.73	2.10
85.	Tattling	17.7	16.0	2.36	1.75	1.67	1.25	1.47	1.50
86.	Teasing	39.1	28.0	2.94	2.86	2.07	1.86	1.94	2.29
87.	Theft	55.2	72.0	1.79	2.39	3.38	3.47	2.05	2.00
88.	Threatening teacher	33.9	48.0	0.93	1.33	3.47	3.67	3.13	3.42
89.	Threatening other students	42.7	56.0	1.86	2.14	3.26	3.57	2.94	2.71
90.	Threat of physical violence	34.7	56.0	1.62	1.79	3.26	3.50	3.13	3.07
91.	Throwing objects (spitballs, paper wads, rocks, rubber bands, etc.)	56.5	60.0	2.38	2.60	2.63	2.80	2.73	2.80
92.	Turning in assignments late	42.7	40.0	3.09	3.00	2.63	2.80	0.94	1.70
93.	Use of alcohol (before school)	43.5	60.0	1.27	1.60	3.23	3.67	1.80	1.64

	Behavior	% Perceiving As Discipline		Mean Frequency of Observation		Mean Level of Seriousness		Mean Degree of Interference	
		Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators	Teachers	Administrators
94.	Use of alcohol (while at school)	38.7	44.0	0.94	1.54	3.41	3.82	2.21	2.00
95.	Use of drugs other than marijuana (before school)	34..	56.0	1.05	1.00	3.47	3.86	1.92	1.46
96.	Use of drugs other than marijuana (while at school)	35.9	52.0	0.90	1.00	3.56	3.92	2.25	2.00
97.	Using foul, obscene, abusing language	62.5	72.0	2.93	2.78	3.22	3.17	2.69	2.82
98.	Vandalism to school property (cutting breaking, marring, marking, etc.)	76.6	84.0	2.21	2.14	3.30	3.57	2.14	2.00
99.	Vandalism to community property	39.1	36.0	1.77	1.78	3.36	3.11	1.77	1.22
100.	Verbal hostility	48.8	52.0	2.66	2.62	3.15	3.00	2.92	2.77
101.	Violations of dress code	22.6	20.0	1.81	1.60	1.98	1.80	1.62	1.80

Conclusions

Although for the purposes of this presentation tests of statistical inference were not made, several general observations can be made.

Many writers continue to publish books, monographs, and articles on the subject of student discipline. Many of these works approach the subject from the perspective of the theoritician or philosopher whose view may or may not be of immediate, or even long range, applicability. Most of the remainder are derived from first hand observations of practitioners, whose views must logically be affected by their own biases and experiences. There is very little current, objective , research-based information available to help identify which student discipline problem are actually being faced and in what frequencies by educators in the field. Without this information, it does not seem probable that teachers, administrators, program developers, or teacher-trainers can effectively utilize educational planning processes to improve the teacher's ability to effectively deal with discipline problems.

The similarities between Tables 1 and 3 and between Tables 2 and 4 imply that the student misbehaviors occurring frequently may well be the same as those misbehaviors which are more likely to be perceived by both teachers and administrators to be discipline problems. On the other hand, there is apparently little hope for reaching a consensus among teachers of which misbehaviors actually constitute discipline problems. If over 32 percent of teachers and 28 percent of administrators perceive dirty hands and face, body odor (personal hygiene) to be a problem of discipline, then it is difficult to conceive of any undesirable student behavior which would not be perceived by at least some educators as discipline problems. Obviously, there is a need for preservice and inservice training of both teachers and administrators in identifying those behaviors which constitute legitimate discipline problems as

opposed to physiological, psychological, and other types of problems. It would seem apparent that these latter problems might be handled differently if they were identified as something other than discipline problems. For example, the student who is sleeping in class might well be on drugs, he might be working nights to support himself or his family, or there might be temporary disruptions at home which interrupt normal sleep routines. To automatically label all student behaviors which are irritating to the teacher as disciplinary in nature is almost certainly a mistake.

In general, it does appear that those student misbehaviors which occur most frequently, as perceived by both administrators and teachers, tend to be fairly passive in nature. It is encouraging to note that none of the most frequently observed misbehaviors appear on either the list of the most serious or the lists of the most interfering problems. Thus, the problems teachers and administrators must deal with most frequently are clearly not of the most grave nature.

In conclusion, the findings of this study suggest, not surprisingly, that teachers, who deal with the individual classroom work of the student, hold different perceptions of student discipline than administrators, who must be concerned with the problems of the school at large. Fifty years ago, Wickman concluded that teachers regarded as most serious those problems which transgressed their moral sensitivities and authority or which frustrated their immediate teaching purposes. The current study indicates the same finds of problems exist today and are still perceived to be disciplinary in nature by both teachers and administrators; however, a remarkable change has taken place regarding the kinds of problems perceived to be most serious. The educator of today considers the most serious student misbehaviors to be those of a violent or drug related nature, even though not faced with such

problems at a high level of frequency. Indeed, the relative infrequency of such problems in Indiana schools must be interpreted as a very positive note in the general clamor over student violence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Colver, A. C., Richter, J. P. "Yes" to a self-directed day - focus on high schools. Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 53, no. 2, October 1971.

Dickinson, J. A. A concept of discipline for new teachers. In J. S. Kujoth (Ed.), The Teacher and School Discipline. Metchen, J. J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1970.

Dobson, R., Dobson, M., & Kinkaid, G. Teachers' and students' perceptions of behavioral problems and prescribed treatments. Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education. Vol. 9, no. 4, Summer 1971.

Eckbreth, C. Discipline in the secondary classroom. Social Education. Vol. 42, no. 2, February 1978.

Feldhusen, J. F. Behavioral Problems in Secondary Schools. Purdue University, West Lafayette, 1978. NIE P 770202.

Fuchs, J. E., Fenn, J. D., & Reid, J. T. An approach to student misbehavior. NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 62, no. 414, January 1978.

Glasser, W. Ten steps to good discipline. Education Digest. Vol. 43, no. 6, February 1978.

Gorton, R. A. Responding to student misbehavior. NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 61, January 1977.

Griggs, M. B. Managing behavior in the classroom. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics. Vol. 21, no. 1, September - October 1977.

Harris, Pickens E. Changing Conceptions of School Discipline. New York: MacMillan, 1928.

Hollomon, J. W. Dealing With Childrens' Unacceptable Classroom Behaviors. San Antonio, 1976.

Hymes, J. L., Jr. Behavior and Misbehavior - A Teacher's Guide to Action. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

Jenkins, G. G. The real meaning of discipline. In J. S. Kujoth (Ed.), The Teacher and School Discipline. Metchen, M. J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1970.

Lambert, B. G. Behavior Clinics: A Method to Change Attitudes? NIE, Washington, D. C., 1976.

Mikulsky, D. Discipline in the Schools: An Annotated Bibliography. NIE, Washington, D. C., 1976.

Bibliography (Con't.)

National Education Association Journal, Today's Education. Selected Articles. 1969.

National Education Association Journal, Today's Education. September - October, 1976.

Nickerson, N. C. The lonely student in the lonely school, NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 62, no. 415, February 1978.

Sanders, J. Lets Put Classroom Discipline Back in the Basics. Kingsville, 1977.

Schain, R. L. Discipline - How to Establish and Maintain it. New York: Atherton Press, 1961.

Schain, R. L., & Polner, M. Using Effective Discipline for Better Class Control. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

Sheviakov, G. V., & Redl, F. Discipline for Today's Children and Youth. Revised by Syvil K. Richardson, Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1956.

Stiavelli, R. E., & Sykes, D. E. The guidance clinic - an alternative to suspension. NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 56, no. 363, April 1972.

Sussman, S. A Critical Examination of Discipline Theories and Practice. Toronto: New Borough of Education, 1976.

Thompson, G. Discipline and the high school teacher. The Clearing House. Vol. 49, no. 9, May 1976.

Wasell, I. T. Discipline in the classroom - a positive factor. In J. S. Kujoth (Ed.), The Teacher and School Discipline. Metchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1970.

Wickman, E. K. Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes. The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1929.